

Appl. No. 10/708,327  
Amtd. dated May 13, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 08, 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plants  
5 et al. (5,952,847).

**Response:**

**Claim 1**

10

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of original claims 2 and 3. No new matter is introduced.

As the Examiner has stated in the section "Conclusion" of this Office action, claim 3  
15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since the base claim and intervening claim of original claim 3 are original claims 1 and 2, and amended claim 1 includes all of the limitations of original claims 1-3, applicants believe that amended claim 1 has been placed in condition for  
20 allowance. Claims 5-9 are dependent on amended claim 1, and should be allowable if the amended claim 1 is found allowable.

**New Claims**

25 **Claims 17-23**

Claim 17 is added and includes limitations of original claims 1, 2, and 7. Claims

Appl. No. 10/708,327  
Amdt. dated May 13, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 08, 2005

18-23 correspond to original claims 3-6 and 8-9. No new matter is introduced.

As the Examiner has stated in the section "Conclusion" of this Office action, claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the 5 limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since the base claim and intervening claim of original claim 7 are original claims 1 and 2, and new claim 17 includes all of the limitations of original claims 1-2 and 7, applicants believe that new claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Claims 18-23 are dependent on new claim 17, and should be allowable if 10 claim 17 is found allowable.

Claims 24-31

Claim 24 is added and includes limitations of original claims 1 and 9. Claims 25-31 15 correspond to original claims 2-8. No new matter is introduced.

As the Examiner has stated in the section "Conclusion" of this Office action, claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since the base 20 claim of original claim 9 is original claim 1 and no intervening claim lies between original claims 1 and 9, and new claim 24 includes all of the limitations of original claims 1 and 9, applicants believe that new claim 24 is in condition for allowance. Claims 25-31 are dependent on new claim 24, and should be allowable if claim 24 is found allowable.

25

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/708,327  
Amtd. dated May 13, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 08, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

*Winston Hsu*

Date: May 13, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan).